UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,583	03/25/2004	Jason M. Bell	AUS920040052US1	7109

45993   7590   04/14/2009
IBM CORPORATION (RHF)
C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ
P. O. BOX 23324
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123

EXAMINER
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 January 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *8,12,13 and 20-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *8,12,13 and 20-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/28/09*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 8, 12, 13 and 20-28 are rejected and claims 1-7, 9-11 and 14-19 are

canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 28

January 2009 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 28 January 2009 is in

compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure

statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

4.   Claims 1, 20, 23 and 26 objected to because of the following informalities:

        Claim 1, line 11; claim 20, line 9; and claim 23, line 7 each recite the term

"attributed." It appears that the "d" on the end of the term is a typographical error.

        Claim 26 fails to end in a period.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6.   Claims 8, 12, 13 and 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as

failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject

matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application

was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Independent claims 8, 20 and 23

recite the limitation "responsive to said resolving, converting said obtained attribute

value from a first value format to a second value format, wherein said first value format

is incompatible with said directory access protocol, and wherein said second value

format is compatible with said directory access protocol." The examiner fails to find

support within the specification for this limitation. Since the dependent claims fail to

overcome the rejections of the independent claims, claims 9-13, 21, 22 and 24-28 are

rejected on the same grounds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the

various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the

obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each

claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order

for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35

U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8.   **Claims 8, 12, 13 and 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over US PGPub 2002/0147857 to Sanchez, II et al (hereafter

Sanchez) in view of US PGPub 2008/0086402 to Patel et al (hereafter Patel) in view

of US PGPub 2003/0120502 to Robb et al (hereafter Robb).

Referring to claim 8, Sanchez discloses a method comprising:

providing at least one declaration for a directory attribute (see [0050]);

receiving a directory protocol request for access to one or more attribute values

from said associated directory structure (see [0056]);

invoking at least one Real-Time Attribute Processor (RTAP) selector from a

plurality of attribute processor according to a predetermined selection schema and to

invoke said selected RTAP (see [0030], lines 7-15); and

returning to a requester said attribute value [populating the object] (see [0062]).

However, Sanchez fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations wherein the attributes are to be handled as a real-time attribute associated with but external to a directory structure; detecting in said received request a request to access an attributed as a real-time external attribute; and responsive to said detecting of a request for a real-time attribute, resolving a real-time value by obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure. Patel discloses wherein the attributes are to be handled as a real-time attribute associated with but external to a directory structure; detecting in said received request a request to access an attributed as a real-time external attribute; and responsive to said detecting of a request for a real-time attribute, resolving a real-time value by obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure [attributes fetched in real-time] and being in a format incompatible with a directory access return format and obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure (see [0074] and [1056]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize concept of fetching dynamic attributes in real-time as disclosed by Patel with the logical device of Sanchez. One would have been motivated to so in order to introduce the concept of providing customer personalization in real-time to Sanchez which increases accuracy of the dynamic data and decreases the resources required to poll and push dynamic data to the LDAP (Patel: see [0005]).

The combination of Sanchez/Patel (hereafter Sanchez/Patel) fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of responsive to said resolving, converting said obtained attribute value from a first value format to a second value format, wherein said first

value format is incompatible with said directory access protocol, and wherein said

second value format is compatible with said directory access protocol; and returning to

a requester said real-time value in said second format attribute value according to said

directory access protocol while suppressing or avoiding storing of said converted

attribute value in said directory structure. Robb discloses directory services, including

the further limitations of responsive to said resolving, converting said obtained attribute

value from a first value format to a second value format, wherein said first value format

is incompatible with said directory access protocol, and wherein said second value

format is compatible with said directory access protocol (see [0074] and [0076]); and

returning to a requester said real-time value in said second format attribute value

according to said directory access protocol while suppressing or avoiding storing of said

converted attribute value in said directory structure [dynamic content verses static

content] (see [0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize steps of Robb for reformatting and retrieving the attribute value in

real-time with the steps of Sanchez/Patel. One would have been motivated to do so in

order to make the system compatible with a plurality of resources and applications and

also to reduce the amount of storage required.

Referring to claim 12, Sanchez/Patel/Robb discloses the method as set forth in

claim 8 wherein said detecting comprises parsing a request comprises parsing a

Lightweight Directory Access Protocol [LDAP] requests for attribute values (Sanchez:

see [0008]).

Referring to claim 13, Sanchez/Patel/Robb discloses the method as set forth in claim 8 wherein said returning comprises returning said value according to a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 20, Sanchez discloses a computer readable memory comprising: a computer readable memory suitable for encoding computer programs; and one or more computer programs encoded by said computer readable memory (see Fig 1) and configured to:

provide at least one declaration for a directory attribute (see [0050]);

receive a directory protocol request for access to one or more attribute values from said associated directory structure (see [0056]);

invoke at least one Real-Time Attribute Processor (RTAP) selector from a plurality of attribute processor according to a predetermined selection schema and to invoke said selected RTAP (see [0030], lines 7-15); and

return to a requester said attribute value [populating the object] (see [0062]).

However, Sanchez fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations wherein the attributes are to be handled as a real-time attribute associated with but external to a directory structure; detect in said received request a request to access an attributed as a real-time external attribute; and responsive to said detecting of a request for a real-time attribute, resolve a real-time value by obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure. Patel discloses wherein the attributes are to be handled as a real-time attribute associated with but external to a directory structure; detect in said received request a request to access an attributed as a real-time external

attribute; and responsive to said detecting of a request for a real-time attribute, resolving

a real-time value by obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said

directory structure [attributes fetched in real-time] and being in a format incompatible

with a directory access return format and obtaining an attribute value from a real-time

source external to said directory structure (see [0074] and [1056]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize concept of fetching dynamic attributes in real-time as disclosed by

Patel with the logical device of Sanchez. One would have been motivated to so in order

to introduce the concept of providing customer personalization in real-time to Sanchez

which increases accuracy of the dynamic data and decreases the resources required to

poll and push dynamic data to the LDAP (Patel: see [0005]).

Sanchez/Patel fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of responsive to

said resolving, converting said obtained attribute value from a first value format to a

second value format, wherein said first value format is incompatible with said directory

access protocol, and wherein said second value format is compatible with said directory

access protocol; and returning to a requester said real-time value in said second format

attribute value according to said directory access protocol while suppressing or avoiding

storing of said converted attribute value in said directory structure. Robb discloses

directory services, including the further limitations of responsive to said resolving,

converting said obtained attribute value from a first value format to a second value

format, wherein said first value format is incompatible with said directory access

protocol, and wherein said second value format is compatible with said directory access

protocol (see [0074] and [0076]); and returning to a requester said real-time value in

said second format attribute value according to said directory access protocol while

suppressing or avoiding storing of said converted attribute value in said directory

structure [dynamic content verses static content] (see [0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize steps of Robb for reformatting and retrieving the attribute value in

real-time with the steps of Sanchez/Patel. One would have been motivated to do so in

order to make the system compatible with a plurality of resources and applications and

also to reduce the amount of storage required.

Referring to claim 21, Sanchez/Patel/Robb discloses the computer readable

memory as set forth in claim 20 wherein said detecting comprises parsing a Lightweight

Directory Access Protocol [LDAP] requests for attribute values (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 22, Sanchez/Patel/Robb discloses the computer readable

memory as set forth in claim 20 wherein said returning comprises returning said value

according to a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 23, Sanchez discloses a system comprising hardware means

for performing a logical process, wherein said logical process comprises:

providing at least one declaration for a directory attribute (see [0050]);

receiving a directory protocol request for access to one or more attribute values

from said associated directory structure (see [0056]);

invoking at least one Real-Time Attribute Processor (RTAP) selector from a plurality of attribute processor according to a predetermined selection schema and to invoke said selected RTAP (see [0030], lines 7-15); and

returning to a requester said attribute value [populating the object] (see [0062]).

However, Sanchez fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations wherein the attributes are to be handled as a real-time attribute associated with but external to a directory structure; detecting in said received request a request to access an attributed as a real-time external attribute; and responsive to said detecting of a request for a real-time attribute, resolving a real-time value by obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure. Patel discloses wherein the attributes are to be handled as a real-time attribute associated with but external to a directory structure; detecting in said received request a request to access an attributed as a real-time external attribute; and responsive to said detecting of a request for a real-time attribute, resolving a real-time value by obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure [attributes fetched in real-time] and being in a format incompatible with a directory access return format and obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure (see [0074] and [1056]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize concept of fetching dynamic attributes in real-time as disclosed by Patel with the logical device of Sanchez. One would have been motivated to so in order to introduce the concept of providing customer personalization in real-time to Sanchez

which increases accuracy of the dynamic data and decreases the resources required to

poll and push dynamic data to the LDAP (Patel: see [0005]).

The combination of Sanchez/Patel (hereafter Sanchez/Patel) fails to explicitly

disclose the further limitations of responsive to said resolving, converting said obtained

attribute value from a first value format to a second value format, wherein said first

value format is incompatible with said directory access protocol, and wherein said

second value format is compatible with said directory access protocol; and returning to

a requester said real-time value in said second format attribute value according to said

directory access protocol while suppressing or avoiding storing of said converted

attribute value in said directory structure. Robb discloses directory services, including

the further limitations of responsive to said resolving, converting said obtained attribute

value from a first value format to a second value format, wherein said first value format

is incompatible with said directory access protocol, and wherein said second value

format is compatible with said directory access protocol (see [0074] and [0076]); and

returning to a requester said real-time value in said second format attribute value

according to said directory access protocol while suppressing or avoiding storing of said

converted attribute value in said directory structure [dynamic content verses static

content] (see [0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize steps of Robb for reformatting and retrieving the attribute value in

real-time with the steps of Sanchez/Patel. One would have been motivated to do so in

order to make the system compatible with a plurality of resources and applications and also to reduce the amount of storage required.

Referring to claim 24, Sanchez/Patel/Robb discloses the system as set forth in Claim 23 wherein said hardware means comprises at least in part a microprocessor (Sanchez: see Fig 1).

Referring to claim 25, Sanchez/Patel/Robb discloses the system as set forth in Claim 23 wherein said hardware means comprises at least in part an electronic circuit (Sanchez: see Fig 1).

Referring to claim 26, Sanchez/Patel/Robb discloses the system as set forth in Claim 25 wherein said electronic circuit is selected from a group comprising an application specific integrated circuit, and a programmable logic circuit (see Fig 1).

Referring to claim 27, Sanchez/Patel/Robb discloses the system as set forth in claim 23 wherein said detecting comprises parsing a request comprises parsing a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol [LDAP] requests for attribute values (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 28, Sanchez/Patel/Robb discloses the method as set forth in claim 23 wherein said returning comprises returning said value according to a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is

(571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/   /Kimberly Lovel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167   Examiner
                                                       Art Unit 2167

12 April 2009
/KL/